9/3/68

Dear Maggie,

The CDV newsletter of 8/8, which arrived today and is the first I have seen since the initial issue, has your excellent response to Epstein. I am writing to indicate to you a few areas (not connected with the reply at all) in which I have considerably more knowledge. I am sending it for your personal information only because it is in one of my three unpublished books and want no public use made until it appears, as perhaps, some day, it might. Where I intend another context, I think it will be clear.

Hoke May, Ross Yockey and Sam de Pina took me to lunch 4/28/67 and then told me they had been told by Plotkin that he was being paid by CIA.

You are correct in quoting the introduction to Oswald in New Orleans, which I wrote for the purpose of establishing Garrison's independence as well as my own. It was horribly butchered in editing and has much on Clark-Shaw-Bertrand that has never been published. I avoided personal contact with Jim, delayed my grand jury appearance until 10 days after this book was in the mail, to obviate just the sort of thing Epstein attempts. I never spoke to or met Jim until the night of April 27, the night before my testimony.

There is always a question in shortening quotes. We all face the problem. I think your contraction of Epstein's allusion to me is too incomplete and does alter the sense, at least in part.

That business of Oswald allegedly having the "Symbol Number 179" is a booby trap for us. That is not at all the case. This number had an entirely different significance that I have traced down, but not yet completely, and is only one of the numbers connected with Oswald. It was never once, not even in secret, by its right description. It is an account number and only that. I now have enough on Oswald as a possible agent to do a book on that alone, and it is possible I will get more. However, since he was never Agent No. 179 (or 172 in another version), there was no trouble making official denial of it.

More than Wade and Carr were flown to Washington for the 1/22/64 meeting. I have some rather significant information about it - and what was known and suppressed.

On that secret Miami tape, what you say is in essence correct but it is rather incomplete, from what I now know and have, which includes the names of the men on the tape and who they are. You will eventually see what I hope you will, after all that we have published and learned, regard as a really shocking, rotten thing. I call that book COUP D'ETAT. That was only one of four related such things. I have identified the Brown on that tape (he died in 1965) and the others connected with them, as well as those mentioned in the conversation. You are correct in saying that the Miami police, in playing the tape for newsmen (which, I am satisfied, is because they knew of Garrison's investigation), did not make any attempt to evaluate it. For your information, their private evaluation is mine and what I presume yours is. But they have a firm opinion, not for public use. The description of the planned assassination is more detailed than the paper you cite printed, and I have much more on that, too. I have no doubt of the ligitimacy of that entire thing. If you use this again, you may want to cite the Report, which says that the records for the period ending November 8, the day before this tape was made, were searched, and for the Dallas-Fort Worth area only. The stuff on the Birmingham Church bombing I now have includes the type of expcsive and how it was placed, etc.

On Clark-Shaw: I am satisfied it is FBI interception of the ms of

Oswald in New Orleans is the reason Clark made his false statement. That ms said that Shaw had been investigated but that no investigation of him was required because the FBI knew all about him. I have a tape-recorded interview with one of the government's people in that part of the story in which he tells me that he, personally, gave the FBI a signed statement on Shaw. I also know that Shaw was investigated during World War II, second hand from the FBI, and not for the kind of activities that would make him like JFK. There is a typo in the newsletter here. The date of the a.m. papers was March 2, not 27.

If you can recall any more than you say about Epstein saying in Sylvia's apartment that at a Commission meeting in June of 1964 one of the members said they had no case, I'd particularly want to know, because I am working in just that area andhave half of a book written on it. The exact date would be very important, or his source (Liebeler?), if not the member. In strictest confidence, I am in touch with one member, who is friendly, on something kind of related to this.

I do not doubt that you have what you consider sufficient reason for your silence, perhaps have an idea of what causes it and am content to leave it that way until you ultimately learn what I have no doubt you will. So, this requires no answer of you, unless you want amplification, which you can have in confidence, or do have more on that Epstein quote. I have initiated something along that line that has a chance of being very important and, as I said, I have done some writing and investigating and will do more. The fruit of the investigation is, I think, very, very important, bears much on conspiracy, and may, eventually, get us some valuable allies.

With best personal regards,

Harold Weisberg